

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1-68 and 91-92, drawn to a base station and system having a method of allocating at least one time slot of the plurality of time slots in the frame to a user equipment.
  - II. Claims 69-90, drawn to user equipment for receiving a signal from a base station directing the user equipment to at least one timeslot of the plurality of time slots.
2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions Group I and Group II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination are separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination Group II has separate utility such as an user equipment for receiving a signal from a base station directing the user equipment to at least one timeslot of the plurality of time slots. See MPEP § 806.05(d).
3. Because these inventions are independent and distinct for the reason(s) given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown above by their

recognized divergent subject matter and a different field of search is required for each group (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper

4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention or a species to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

5. The election of an invention or a species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

6. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pablo Tran whose telephone number is (571)272-7898. The examiner normal hours are 9:30 -5:00 (Monday-Friday). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban, can be reached at (571)272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.
9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) System. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-directauspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 25, 2008

/Pablo N Tran/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618